



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

with the consent of the Metropolitan."—*Distinction, xxiii. c. 1.*

Our readers may remember some late cases, in which the Pope set aside those elected by the Roman Catholic priests in Ireland, and appointed Roman Catholic Bishops who were neither "elected by the clergy, nor asked for by the People, nor ordained by the Bishops of the Province;" and who, therefore, according to Pope Leo I. and Pope Nicholas II. can with no reason be reckoned among the Bishops.

Gratian took the following from a decree of Pope Urban in the Placentine Synod:—"We judge that ordinations are void which were made by leaders of heresy, excommunicated by name, and by those who have invaded the sees of Catholic Bishops yet living." *Caus. IX. qu. i. c. 5.*

Clearly this Pope did not know that ordinations by those who had once received the power of order, though given in heresy, schism, or under excommunication, was necessarily valid, by virtue of the indelible character!

In the year 1130 there were two rival Popes, Innocent II. and Anacletus II. (Peter Leo). Innocent II. at last won the victory, and then, in the second GENERAL COUNCIL of Lateran, A. D. 1139, he made this decree:—"The ordinations made by Peter Leo and other schismatics and heretics, we make void, and pronounce them of no effect."

In the year 1159, or thereabouts, there were THREE rival Popes—Alexander III., Victor IV. (Octavian), Pascal III. (Guido Cremensis), and soon after rose another claimant, Callistus III. (John Abbot of Struma); and when Alexander III. won the day, and beat all his brother Popes, he passed this decree, in the third General Council of Lateran, with this title prefixed:—

"Concerning ABOLISHING the ordinations introduced by the anti-popes:—

"We, renewing that which was done by our predecessor, Innocent, of happy memory, pronounce that ordinations are void which were made by Octavian and Guido, the heresiarchs, and John of Struma, who followed them; and by those who were ordained by them."

This latter decree is in the book of Decretals of Pope Gregory IX. (lib. v. Tit. viii., c. 1.), a book of the very highest authority in the Church of Rome, of which Devoti himself says, "Whatever is comprehended in them makes the law."

These decrees of Pope Innocent II. and Pope Alexander III. were both decrees made by Popes in GENERAL COUNCIL, and ought, therefore, to be infallible. Both these decrees entirely abolish and make void the ordinations of Peter Leo, Octavian, Guido, and John of Struma: no one denies that these four men were all consecrated Bishops, in regular form, by persons who had received episcopal consecration. Yet Pope Innocent II. and Pope Alexander III., and the second and third General Councils of Lateran, made no scruple of declaring that the persons ordained by them were not ordained at all.

It was natural that a Pope who had stood a hard battle with a rival Pope should not admit his rival's ordinations as valid; and considering what the law of the Church had always been, it was reasonable that he should declare his rival's ordinations invalid, provided that he himself were, indeed, the right Bishop of Rome, and the other the wrong one; which is more than we can vouch in every case for the man who had the luck to win.

But the case is clear, that in the 12th century the Popes themselves had not yet conceived the notion that ordinations made in heresy or schism, or under excommunication, by Bishops who had once received the power of order, were necessarily valid. Pope Leo, in the 5th century; Pope Gregory, in the 6th; Pope Nicholas II., in the 11th; Pope Urban II., in the 11th; Pope Innocent II., in the 12th; Pope Alexander III., in the 12th; and the general councils (truly so called) of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, and those other general councils (falsely so called) of Lateran II. and Lateran III., all held that such orders were utterly void in themselves, and ought to be so declared by the Church.

That which we are now called on to believe, as part of the infallible doctrine of the Church of Rome, that ordination given in heresy, in schism, or under excommunication, by a Bishop who had once had the "indelible character" impressed on his soul, inherited perhaps through a succession of heretics, or schismatics, is, indeed, a necessary consequence of the decrees of Trent. But it is clearly a modern invention; it does not seem to have gained ground even as an "opinion" until the 13th century; we do not know that it had any authority given to

it in the Church of Rome itself until the Council of Trent. If there be any decree in its favour before the Council of Trent, we request that some of our able Roman Catholic correspondents will point it out to us.

On the one hand we have Pope and General Councils for 1200 years admitting or asserting that ordinations by a consecrated Bishop might be invalid, and that the power of orders might be lost. On the other hand, we have the infallible Council of Trent affirming that the indelible character can never be lost, and can never fail of accomplishing an effect. What difference among men can compare to this, when infallibility changes its mind?

It may seem strange to our readers that the modern Church of Rome, in spite of its own books of canon law, should insist on maintaining that orders among heretics or schismatics may yet be valid. But to us it is not strange; for nothing exalts the power of the ministry so much as this. It amounts to this, that when Christ had ordained a Ministry, He, in fact, parted with His own power, and divested Himself of the rule and government of His own Church: for if the ministers whom He has appointed may set aside His will, and yet continue to exercise supernatural power in His Church, in the very acts which are opposed to His will, then the kingdom is theirs, and not His; and they thenceforth stand in the position of gods upon earth. No room is left to question whether they do right or wrong; although it should appear that they were exalting themselves against God Himself, yet mankind would have nothing for it but to bow down and serve them.

We believe that the doctrine of the "indelible character," and the "necessary effect" of its operation, even in heresy and schism, is essential to the system of the Church of Rome. We believe, that to understand the subordination of the office of the ministry to the work and purpose for which that office was instituted, is essential to the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free. We have therefore given our readers the means to judge whether the doctrine of the modern Church of Rome be indeed the doctrine of the ancient Church; and we trust it may lead to further consideration of the use and purpose of a ministry in the Church of Christ.

#### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters meant for publication should be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-street, and the real name and address given, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.

We earnestly request our correspondents, both Protestants and Roman Catholics, to limit the length of their communications, when possible, and not in any case to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN is registered for transmission beyond the United Kingdom.

#### TO SUBSCRIBERS.

WE respectfully beg to remind our subscribers that their subscriptions are payable in advance. Many seem to forget altogether that such are the terms on which we have undertaken to furnish our paper, though from the very commencement they have been so stated in the heading of every number. The very smallness of the sum, we have no doubt, often leads to the neglect of which we complain, though the unusually low price of the paper, in fact, makes the delay the more embarrassing to the conductors. The stamp duty and paper are extremely heavy items, necessarily paid in advance, and, though 3s. 6d. is a very small sum to individuals, the whole expense of so many thousand copies is very heavy indeed.

## The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, MAY 19, 1858.

TIME was when images of the Madonna were believed to have miraculously protected the town and its inhabitants that were happy enough to possess such a palladium. Tempora mutantur. It seems now that it is the people who protect the images; at least so it would appear to be in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome, if we are to judge by the following narrative, copied from the *Univers* by the *Tablet*, of 24th April last.

The consternation into which both his Holiness the Pope and the Jesuit Fathers seem to have been thrown, and the popular commotion excited by a mere act of brigandage, among the devout and enlightened image-worshippers of Velletri, would be not a little amusing, as well as edifying, were it not sad to contemplate the state of grovelling ignorance and superstition to which the Italian people seem to have been reduced under

the very eyes of their Ecclesiastical rulers of the Court of Rome.

Riots are doubtless not uncommon in other places, but a religious riot, urged on by distrust of the clergy, and suspicion of their having stolen the idol which was the object of the devout affection of the mob, we really suppose never took place elsewhere than in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome itself.

The following is the narrative transcribed by the *Tablet* from the *Univers* verbatim, merely marking in italics a few lines, which strike us particularly:—

"In the Cathedral of Velletri, near Rome, was an image of the Virgin, nearly covered with gold, and decked out with necklaces, rings, and jewellery, and it was held in great veneration by the people. In the Holy Week it was, according to custom, screened from view by a curtain, and on Holy Thursday some person contrived to steal it. On Good Friday the archpriest of the cathedral received a note thus conceived:—'I, the undersigned, know the thief, and the spot in which is deposited the image of the Madonna, and I will make revelations on three conditions: impunity for myself, the release of my brother, who is to be condemned to death, and a pension of ten crowns a month.—VENDETTA.'"

The archpriest having ascertained that the image really had been abstracted, communicated the strange epistle to the delegate, Mgr. Giordani. Instead of seeking at once for the writer of the letter, this dignitary applied to Rome for orders, and the Pope, fearing the total loss of the image, and the effect that would be produced amongst the people, resolved that the first condition of the bandit should be accepted, but that the other two should be rejected. Vendetta, having learned this resolution, spread amongst the people of Velletri the news of the robbery of the image, which the clergy of the cathedral had kept secret, and he wrote to the clergy that he would be content with impunity for himself, and with 500 crowns paid down. On Saturday the people went en masse to the church, and waited with anxiety for the arrival of that part of the service in which the crucifixes and images are uncovered; but the veil which had covered the image of the Madonna was not removed. On Sunday the people again went to the church, but, as the image was not displayed, they became excited, and murmured; and at length some of them got on the altar, and tore down the curtain. The rumour was then spread by the friends of Vendetta that it was the Jesuits who had stolen the Madonna; and the excited people, believing the falsehood, broke into the convent occupied by the Jesuits, which is adjacent to the cathedral, and, with cries of 'La Madonna nostra!' completely sacked it, and ill-treated the reverend fathers. Shortly after, the Suffragan Bishop ascended the pulpit, and exhorted the people who remained in the church to be calm, but they would not listen to him. There is no garrison except ten or twelve veterans in the town, so that no opposition could be made to the mob. When the bishop descended from the pulpit, a scarcely credible scene occurred; the brigand Vendetta, armed with a poignard, ascended it, and thus addressed the people: 'Be patient! The good Fathers are innocent! It is I who stole the Madonna! But I will only restore it when the government, to whom I grant a delay till Monday evening, shall have consented to the compact I have proposed to it. Be calm, therefore, and shout no more! I warn you, in conclusion, that my companions are armed as well as I!' Orders were issued to despatch a troop of gendarmes on horseback and a company of Swiss infantry to Velletri to establish order. Upon the authorities firmly refusing to accede to the demands of the bandit, he agreed to restore the statue without any other condition than immunity to himself. The image has been brought back in procession to the Church of St. Clement, where it is again exposed to public veneration. Vendetta, who is a man of great energy, and no ordinary intelligence, is captured, and now lies incarcerated at Rome."

We strongly suspect that the statement, that the bandit (to whom immunity was promised under the direct orders of the Pope) is now incarcerated at Rome, is incorrect, and certainly no such statement was made when the story first appeared in the *Univers*, from which it was copied into the *Times* Newspaper, on 16th April last. Whether the necklaces, rings, and jewellery, and gold, with which the image was bedecked, were also restored, does not appear; but that the brigand actually ascended the pulpit, from which the Bishop had just come down, because the people would not listen to him, and defended the Jesuit fathers by publicly confessing that he himself was the thief, appears to be quite beyond doubt. The Jesuits were, we suppose, peculiar favourites of Vendetta, and will, no doubt, do him the good office, in return, of recommending him to the tender

"Nulla ratio sinit, ut inter episcopos habeantur, qui nec a clericis sunt electi, nec a plebis expetiti, nec a provincialibus episcopis cum Metropolitanis iudicio consecrati."

"Ordinationes, quæ ab heresiarchis nominatim excommunicatis factæ sunt, et ab eis qui Catholicorum adhuc vivunt episcoporum sedes invaserunt, irritas esse iudicamus." This Pope gives a partial dispensation on account of great necessity then existing, but forbids that this should be a precedent against the canons in future.

"Ordinationes factas a Petro Leone et aliis schismaticis et hereticis evasimus, et irritas esse censuimus.—*Con. Lat. II. c. 20. Labbe and Coss. x. 109.*

"De abolenda ordinationibus ab antipapalibus introductis.

Quod a predecessoribus nostris felicis memorie Innocentio factum est, innovamus, ordinationes ab Octaviano et Guidone heresiarchis necnon et Joanne Strumensi, qui eos secutus est, factas, et ab ordinatis ab eis, irritas esse censuimus.—*Con. Lat. III., c. 2. Labbe and Coss. vol. x. 158.*

"Quidquid igitur in his comprehenditur, legem facit.—*Devoti, Jua. Can. Vol. I., p. 379.*

care of the Virgin, when the promised immunity arrives, in the shape of the dungeon or the scaffold.

Why, however, we may ask, did the Pope "fear the total loss of the image, or the effect that would thereby be produced amongst the people?" Did the Pope himself really attach any particular value to the piece of wood or stone of which the image was composed, distinct from the gold and jewellery with which it was bedizened? or was it that he feared that the eyes of the people of Velletri might be opened to the folly of trusting in an image, which, so far from protecting them, was unable to protect itself? or that their devotion to the Virgin was so mixed up with devotion to this particular image that if it were lost, the devotion of the populace would vanish with it? We really cannot answer these questions in any way which would not demonstrate the truth of what we have so often asserted, that *image-worship* is practically well known by educated Roman Catholics to be something more than a mere "means of raising the mind to the objects represented."

There is another startling feature in the story—viz., that the clergy of the cathedral kept the robbery a secret, until some of the populace, suspecting that all was not right, got upon the altar, tore down the curtain, and thus discovered the theft! No wonder that they should suspect that the priests were themselves the culprits, when they had taken such pains to conceal the perpetration of the crime. Their motive in the attempted concealment must have been the same apprehension that was felt by the Pope, that the effect which would be produced upon the people would be something much more formidable than merely to rouse their indignation against the sacrilegious felon who had so audaciously robbed their Church. Such a feeling would have caused no apprehension to either the Pope or clergy, as it would have made in favour of the ecclesiastical authorities, and not against them, and, therefore, have increased the chance of bringing the culprit to justice, and recovering the prize. What, then, we ask, could have caused the desire of concealment, and apprehension of discovery? Will any of our thoughtful Roman Catholic readers give us their elucidation of the mystery?

If the good people of Velletri were so ill-instructed in the doctrines of their religion as to view this image as in itself an object of worship, and the cause of either temporal or spiritual benefits to their community, one would have supposed that the Pope and Clergy would have availed themselves of such an opportunity publicly to correct their popular ignorance and error, and show them that it was *superstition* to think that there was any real virtue in wood or stone, and that as the lost image was merely useful as "a means of raising the mind to the object represented," it would be easy to replace the loss, by, perhaps, a worthier representation.<sup>a</sup>

But if, on the other hand, the Pope well knew that the priests, with his full sanction, had always fostered and encouraged the people in this very superstition of a devotion to an image, and that they had perhaps for centuries connived at the popular belief that this particular image was the source of temporal and spiritual blessings to Velletri; that it had wrought miraculous cures; obtained answers to prayer, and afforded supernatural protection to the whole community; then, indeed, the successful abstraction of such an image would have not only been looked upon as a public and irreparable calamity, but the Pope might well have feared "the effect upon the people" of its total loss, as calculated to shake the

foundations of their faith, and extinguish their devotion with the material object of it.

Is it not plain that Romanism has one doctrine for the educated and another for the vulgar? If a wavering Protestant stumbles at the doctrine of the worship of images because it practically leads to idolatry, the Pope and clergy would have a ready answer, that the Council of Trent, while it approved of retaining the images of Christ and His Virgin mother, and the other saints, in their churches, expressly declared that "it was not that they believed that there is any divinity or power in them, or that any thing is to be asked of them, or that trust is to be placed in them, as the heathens of old trusted in their idols."

Well, if this be the belief of educated Roman Catholics, as, no doubt, *theoretically* it is, is it not the more unpardonable that the vulgar should be left century after century in the very opposite belief—that there is a divinity or power which resides in some statues or images more than others? Can any one who reads the above story doubt that the people of Velletri believed this of their image, and that, recollect, in the heart of the Papal States, and in the immediate vicinity of the "holy city" itself, where for more than fifteen hundred years the Church has been all powerful, and the education of the people just what the priesthood dictated, aye, and would now have it made throughout all the rest of the world, if the world would only acknowledge their claims, and submit themselves to their government?

The truth is, that it serves the purpose of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and priesthood to leave the people ignorant and superstitious; and if the latter were taught from their infancy the doctrine of the Council of Trent, vague as it is, a great part of their gains would be gone—pilgrimages to favourite shrines, and costly offerings to renowned Madonnas would be at an end—winking pictures and miraculous statues would be discovered to be impostures, and the people would speedily become emancipated from spiritual bondage, and the world at large open its eyes to the light and truth of the Protestant Reformation.

THE *Rambler* for the present month discloses a system of proselytism in England among the Protestant poor by Roman Catholic landlords and proprietors, against which it would be well that our Protestant friends in England should be put upon their guard. We had long believed that such a system of proselytism was carried on in England unblushingly, by the same party which so loudly, and, we believe, causelessly, denounces *souperism* in Ireland. We thank the *Rambler* for his honest exposure of "*bread-and-butter*" Catholics, and hope it will not be forgotten when the charge of "*souperism*" is again brought forward against Irish Protestants.

"Of all animals, bread-and-butter Catholics are those whom we most abhor. They are redolent of insincerity and hypocrisy. They come before you with their smooth faces and their whining voices; and all the time that they are listening to your expositions of the Catholic religion they are thinking within themselves of the worldly gain their new religion may bring them. Their fervour is in proportion to the length of your purse. Their attendance at mass, and the precision with which they come to their duties, is regulated by the season of the year during which the squire resides at his country-seat. At Christmas they are excellent Catholics; none so devout, none so carried away by the joyousness of the sacred time. From April to August their zeal suffers a remarkable declension. The spring and summer have a depressing influence upon their devotions, and, consequently, during those seasons the missionary priest has more abundant time for study; his confessions become fewer, and his Sunday congregations unpleasantly thin. But, strangest of all, should new times dawn upon the village; if the landlord leave the district to spend some years abroad; if the estate pass into Protestant hands, and wealth and plenty take their departure, leaving in their stead nothing better than poverty and want; somehow or other, these changes seem to create corresponding changes in the faith, the hope, and the charity of these bread-and-butter Catholics. It is astonishing what sympathy exists in their minds between physical and moral changes. A new Protestant landlord awakens, of a sudden, old Protestant recollections. The visions of youth, the scenes of other days, come back again to their

minds; and the end is, that when bread and butter is henceforth to come through a Protestant channel, they give up the faith which can no longer lead to the satisfying of their many temporal wants. From all such Catholics, therefore, we devoutly pray to be delivered; and a landlord cannot commit a greater practical blunder, nor throw away more effectually the advantages of his position, than by lending himself to make converts of this description."

#### WINCHESTER PAMPHLETS—No. I.

JUDGING by the number affixed to the title, "there are more where that came from." We hope to see them in due time.

The Roman Catholic controversy in England engages our interest, but especially where discussion turns on practices existing in Ireland. The title of this pamphlet is well calculated to attract us:—"Delusions and Superstitions of the Irish Catholics discussed, in a series of Letters between the Rev. C. Bowen, and the Rev. J. Collingridge."

This correspondence arose out of the following "extract from the *Hampshire Chronicle* :—Report of a speech delivered by the Rev. C. Bowen, at a meeting of the Winchester Auxiliary Association, in connection with the Society of Irish Church Missions to the Roman Catholics, held at St. John's House, on Tuesday, the 24th November, 1857 :—

"The rev. gentleman described a scene at one of the mountains in the west of Ireland, where men and women were prevailed upon to climb the flinty surface of the rock, on their bare knees, and crawl bleeding to a small chapel, where, going through some simple formula, they were made to believe that they were cleansed from all their sins. He mentioned also another incident. He had seen a car on which a man was being conveyed to a priest, in order to be cured, the process being 'to drive the devils out' with a whip: the car, brought home at night, bore the corpse of the poor deluded man, scourged to death. He had seen this himself. You could not get evidence of the fact sufficient to satisfy the law; but he had seen a man conveyed in the morning for the purpose of undergoing the process, and witnessed his return at night a corpse." (Winchester Pamphlet, p. 3.)

The Rev. Ignatius Collingridge, a Roman Catholic priest at Winchester, wrote to Mr. Bowen for explanation. This at first turned on the case of the man who was whipped. Mr. Bowen replied—

"I mentioned a fact which occurred upwards of thirty years ago, and that I had seen the car returning with the dead body. The occurrence was at the time commonly and freely talked of, and the death attributed to that cause, without hesitation, or much astonishment, by the country people, all Roman Catholics. At the same time, I stated more distinctly than the report has it, that I was not now, or at a former period, able to vouch for the legal truth of the occurrence." (p. 4.)

Mr. Collingridge then wrote to ask for the name of the priest, the name of the man, the place, and the date, which particulars Mr. Bowen, for the reasons above stated, declined to give.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN, not being yet thirty years of age, we have not ourselves heard of any instance of such a method of expelling a devil in Ireland; at the same time, we have heard of so many strange things occurring in Ireland that we should not be surprised if this really happened "thirty years ago." But if it did happen, we would almost expect to find that it was done by a "blessed priest;" that is, by a priest who had been degraded for drunkenness or immorality, and who had, therefore, to live by his wits, in practising on the credulity and superstition of the people. Mr. Collingridge speaks of a miracle which he himself heard of being performed at St. Walstan's well, near Cossey, in Norfolk (p. 24). We think it may be worth his while to inquire whether such miracles in Ireland are not generally worked by such "blessed priests" as we have described above.

Supposing that such a case did occur, we think Mr. Collingridge might, with reason, complain if it were used as an illustration of the practices of the Church of Rome in Ireland. Mr. Bowen admits that he does not believe that it would be done in Ireland now (p. 9.)

We are decidedly of opinion that those who engage in controversy should, above all things, refrain from stating as fact anything which they are not prepared to prove. Controversy on such statements is always unpleasant and unprofitable.

The other subject brought forward by Mr. Bowen, about what took place on the mountain, is more tangible. Mr. Bowen states that the scene he witnessed took place on Croagh Patrick, in Mayo.

Mr. Ignatius Collingridge does not deny the facts as stated to have been witnessed on the mountain, though he admits that those facts look odd: "The outward scene which you described may have an odd look, and I own I never witnessed the like. But what is strange is not necessarily vicious." (p. 19.)

Mr. Collingridge admits that men and women "climb the flinty surface of the rock on their bare knees, and crawl bleeding to a small chapel;" and he approves of this and defends it; he only complains of the statement that by "going through some simple formula, they were made

<sup>a</sup> London C Dolman 71, New Bond-street.

a The shapeless ugliness of most of the favourite images of the Madonna is well known, and educated Roman Catholics are often ashamed of them. The Rev. Hobart Seymour, in his interesting "Mornings among the Jesuits at Rome," gives an instance of this. When speaking to one of these Jesuits of the image of the Virgin, decorated with jewels and votive offerings, in the church of the Augustines, and the profound prostration of the people before it, turning their backs to the High Altar, at the very moment that the priest was elevating the consecrated Host, which they believed to be Jesus Christ bodily and visibly present; the Jesuit merely answered, that "he would not act thus; that he never prayed to the Virgin of the Augustines; that it was not a slightly image; that it was really an ugly image, and had never excited his devotion, and, in fact, he never prayed before it; but it was not fair to judge of the Church by the devotions of the ignorant, or of the devotion to Mary as exhibited by them, inasmuch as they had learned its value by experience," i.e., had been permitted superstitiously to believe that it answered their prayers.